

### **UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.         FILING DATE           087949,850         10714/97	FIRST NAMED INVEN	TOR D	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	<b>)</b> .
CHARLES D HOLLAND MORRISON & FOERSTER 755 PAGE MILL ROAD PALO ALTO CA 94304-1018	MM71/0329	TIVGO	RT UNIT PAPER NUMBE	R
		DATE		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s) 08/949,850

Solanki et al

Examiner

Hung V Ngo

Group Art Unit 2831



Responsive to communication(s) filed on	
This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	•
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for for in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	mal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to ex is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reapplication to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions 37 CFR 1.136(a).	espond within the period for response will cause the
Disposition of Claims	
	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s) 36-44	
Claim(s)	
☐ Claim(s)	
☐ Claims	
	er 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).  priority documents have been  mational Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
Attachment(s)  Notice of References Cited, PTO-892  Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).  Interview Summary, PTO-413  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948  Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restriction

Applicant's election with traverse of claims 23-35 in Paper No. 21 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the office does not provide any reasoning as to why restriction was proper and examine both groups of claims do not place an undue burden on the examiner. This is not found persuasive because in the restriction, the examiner pointed out two different species (Species I, Figures 1 and 2; Species II, Figs 5a-5c) and examining both groups of claims would place an undue burden on the examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 24, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 24, line 2, "the metal lead" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 29, line 1, "the metal lead" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 30 is included because of its dependency.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 23-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams (US 4, 655, 088) in view of Takahashi et al

Adams discloses a housing (10) formed of a polymer material (col 1, line 55-60) having walls (12) (re claims 32, 33), a chamber, a cap (24) and a vent hole (25, 14), multiple leads (13) being partially exposed with the chamber (re claim 30), a wire (23) (re claim 25) (re claim 27), a pressure transducer (20), and recites "the portion of leads 13 which penetrate into the area where semiconductor die 20 is mounted is preferably covered with a passivation material as is semiconductor die 20 in order to protect the lead frames and the die from moisture, and other environmental components" (col 2, lines 20-26), wherein this meets the limitation of "the chamber is filled with a pressure transfer medium" (re claims 26), but do not disclose a metal base (re claim 23) formed a ground lead (re claims 24, 29), and the walls extended about the base to expose only a portion of the base (re claim 28), the pressure transfer medium comprising silicone

gel (re claim 31), molding a polymer housing and heating the lead having the downset portion (re claims 34, 35).

Takahashi et al disclose a metal base (7) of a lead frame for supporting a presure transducer (col 3, lines 44-45) and the walls extended about the base to expose only a portion of the base (Fig 7). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the exposed metal base with the housing of Adams for the purpose of supporting the pressure transducer as taught by Takahashi et al.

It is a common practice in the electrical art to connect the metal base to a ground lead. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect the metal base to the ground lead of the modified Adams for the purpose of providing a ground terminal for connecting the transducer to external ground.

Silicone gel is a well known pressure transfer medium or encapsulating material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Silicone gel for the pressure transfer medium of Adams, since Silicone gel is known pressure transfer medium the substitution would not alter the function of the package of Adams

The limitations of molding a polymer housing and heating the lead having the downset portion have been considered. However, he presence of process limitations in product claims, which product does not otherwise patentably distinguish over prior art, cannot impart patentability to that product. In re Stephens 145 USPQ 656 (CCPA 1965).

#### Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung V. Ngo whose telephone number is (703) 308-7614. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 05:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3431 or (703) 305-3432.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

Wustine Yuncaid
Kristine Kincaid
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

HVN ·

March 29, 1999